

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. No claims have been amended. Claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22 and 31-38 remain pending and are in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22 and 31-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0010513 to Scherr et al. (“Scherr”) and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0154178 to Barnett et al. (“Barnett”). For the reasons below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under § 103(a).

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for enabling a user to organize a project, and independent claim 31 is directed to a memory medium on which are stored machine instructions for carrying out a method for enabling a user to organize a project. Claims 1 and 31 each recite in part: “(i) displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select, within the integral user environment, wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template and a document; (ii) in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list; and (iii) in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list” (emphasis added).

The Office Action admits that Scherr “doesn’t specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list.” *See* Office Action, pp. 4 and 10. Of course, this deficiency in Scherr means that Scherr does not teach any of the three

limitations of claims 1 and 31 quoted above in the preceding paragraph. First, Scherr fails to teach “(i) displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select,” so there is also no teaching that “the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template and a document.” Second, Scherr fails to teach “in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list.” Scherr does not teach displaying alternative choices of entities, and Scherr would certainly not do so in response to the user selecting one of the categories because such categories were not displayed for selection in the first place. Third, Scherr fails to teach “in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list.” Scherr does not teach providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list, and Scherr would certainly not do so in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected because such alternative categories were not displayed for selection in the first place. Thus, the deficiency of Scherr acknowledged in the Office Action means that Scherr fails to teach at least three limitations of independent claims 1 and 31.

The Office Action attempts to overcome the deficiencies of Scherr by combining the teachings of Scherr with the teachings of Barnett. *See* Office Action, pp. 4 and 10-11. The Office Action characterizes Barnett as:

[A] system for associating entities (e.g., web content) with a users calendar/to-do list (see paragraphs 6, 20, and 92), similar to that of Scherr, but further teaches displaying a plurality of categories available for user selection (see paragraph 96), where upon user selection the user is provided with a list of entities specific to the selected category (see paragraph 97), that are available for user selection to be associated (added to) the to-do list / calendar (see paragraph 98).

See Office Action, pp. 4 and 11.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's characterization of Barnett. In contrast to claims 1 and 31, Barnett has little, if anything, to do with to-do lists. Rather, Barnett discloses a method and system for generating and displaying a calendar containing user-selected events from user-selected categories. *See* Barnett, Abstract, ll. 1-3. In the Background of the Invention, Barnett identifies numerous problems associated with prior art calendaring systems. Paragraph 6 of Barnett describes a specific prior art stand-alone calendaring application in which items or events "having a specific time are shown within the daily schedule at the appropriate time" and those "not having a specific time are listed" in a to-do list "next to the scheduled events." Barnett then goes on to explain the problems and limitations of the prior art calendaring application described in paragraph 6. For example, Barnett states that such calendaring applications "do not provide an easy mechanism for importing events from an outside source in an automated manner." *See* Barnett, ¶ 7. Barnett's disclosed invention attempts to overcome these problems and limitations of the prior art with "a multi-layered online calendaring and purchasing system and method which allows a user to specify categories of events, to view events belonging to the specified categories from the outside sources, and to add selected events from the outside sources to a personal computer." *See* Barnett, ¶ 20. Taken in the proper context, Barnett discloses a calendar system that allows users to populate their calendars by importing calendar events from an outside source in an automated manner.

A careful comparison of claims 1 and 31 to Barnett reveals that Barnett, like Scherr, fails to teach the three claim limitations quoted above. As an initial matter, claims 1 and 31 specifically require "receiving a list of to do items that are displayed within the integral user environment" and "enabling the user to associate an entity with a single to do item selected from

the list of to do items.” Thus, in claims 1 and 31, a selected entity is associated with a single to do item that is already part of a to do list. By contrast, Barnett merely relates to displaying categories of calendar events and then displaying alternative choices of calendar events within a selected category in response to a user selection of a category. While Barnett describes a means for populating a calendar by importing calendar events from an outside source, it does not describe populating a to do list with additional to do items. Even if Barnett did describe a means for populating a to do list with additional to do items, such a disclosure would still fall well short of meeting any of the three claim limitations quoted above because claims 1 and 31 relate to associating a selected entity (e.g., a Web link, a task, a template, a document) with a single, selected to do item that is already included in a to do list. For at least the reasons stated above, Barnett fails to overcome the deficiencies of Scherr acknowledged in the Office Action. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 31 are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claim 13 is directed to a system for enabling organizing a project, wherein the system includes a memory in which a plurality of machine instructions are stored, a display on which text and graphics are displayed, a user input device that enables input and selection of choices provided on the display, and a processor, coupled to the memory, user input device, and the display. The processor of claim 13 executes the plurality of machine instructions to carry out a plurality of functions, including:

(i) displaying an integral user environment to a user on the display to enable access of information pertinent to the project from within the integral user environment;

(ii) receiving a list of to do items that are displayed within the integral user environment on the display, wherein the to do items are reminders created by the user to take certain actions;

(iii) enabling a user to employ the user input device to associate an entity with a single to do item selected from the list of to do items;

(iv) enabling a user to access said entity that is thus associated with the selected to do item, from within the integral user environment;

(v) presenting a plurality of categories of entities on the display within the integral user environment, to enable a user to select a category, wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template and a document;

(vi) in response to a user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities on the display from which a user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list; and

(vii) in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list.

The last three limitations of claim 13 are underlined above because they substantially correspond to the three limitations of claims 1 and 31 discussed above which are not disclosed by either Scherr or Barnett. For example, claim 13 recites “presenting a plurality of categories of entities on the display,” whereas claims 1 and 31 recite “displaying a plurality of categories of entities.” In any event, the Office Action admits that Scherr does not disclose these three limitations of claim 13, and it is also clear from the discussion of claims 1 and 31 above

that Barnett does not disclose these limitations either. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 31 are patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 4-10, 16-22 and 32-38 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 13 and 31 and are patentable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional limitations that are new and novel in the context of the claims from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 4-10, 16-22 and 32-38 are patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22 and 31-38 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or plujin@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Lujin/

Patrick A. Lujin
Reg. No. 35,260

PAL/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550